

REMARKS

Applicant has overcome the Examiner's objection to the drawings by amending Figure 1 as required by the Examiner. The Examiner's objection to claims 1-5 has been mooted by applicant's amendment of claim 1.

Claims 1-4 and 6-9 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) on Junqua (U.S. Patent No. 6,684,185). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 recites a method in which an orthographical input (such as the typed name "Jacques Chirac," as detailed in the example beginning on page 7, line 1, of applicant's specification) is converted into a phonetic transcription. In order to ensure that this phonetic transcription is correct, the phonetic transcription is then further converted into a pseudo-orthographic representation which, in turn, is output such that a user may determine the accuracy of the original conversion.

Applicant's invention is particularly useful in that a layperson is much more likely to be able to assess the accuracy of a pseudo-orthographic representation than to assess the accuracy of a phonetic transcription.

In contrast to applicant's invention, Junqua discloses a method of minimizing the memory footprint of a system in which words are added to a vocabulary stored in a mobile telephone. In Junqua, a "spelled word" is input into a mobile telephone device by either using a keypad or by speaking each letter separately. Each of the letters in the spelled word is then converted into several phonetic transcriptions, and each phonetic transcription is assigned a likelihood of being the correct transcription based on the transcriptions of the surrounding letters and their likelihood. The transcriptions are then analyzed to determine which combinations of transcriptions are most likely to be correct (col. 3, line 37-57). These combinations are then converted into hybrid unit transcriptions using syllabic transcription such that each word is broken down into commonly used syllables and combinations of demi-syllables and phonemes that are used to form less common syllables. Junqua then assigns a predetermined code number to each of the syllables, demi-syllables

and phonemes that are represented, such that only a minimal amount of memory is taken to store multiple phonetic representations of the input word.

Unlike applicant's invention, Junqua does not perform a second conversion to help determine the accuracy of a first conversion. Instead, Junqua discloses a system in which further conversions are only used to reduce a spelled word into known phonetics that likely represent the spelled word.

Furthermore, even if Junqua did disclose a second conversion as recited in claim 1 (which it does not), Junqua never outputs a pseudo-orthographic representation. The only disclosure of an output in Junqua is the output cited by the Examiner at col. 5, lines 33-37, in which Junqua discloses storing the spelled word along with the phonetic representations such that the stored spelled word is displayed when a user's speech is matched to a stored set of phonetic codes. As explained in Junqua, this provides a simple indication to a user that the spoken word was recognized as the stored word. The display of the previously stored spelled word has nothing to do with the accuracy of a conversion into a phonetic script; the displayed word is simply the original spelled word prior to any conversion.

Accordingly, Junqua does not disclose or suggest all of the features recited in claim 1, and claim 1 is therefore allowable. Claim 6 recites features similar to those of claim 1 detailed above; claim 6 is therefore also allowable. Claims 2-4 and 7-9 depend from allowable claims 1 and 6 and are consequently allowable due at least to their dependencies.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) on Junqua in view of Molnar (U.S. Patent No. 6,411,932). Applicant traverses this rejection. Molnar does not disclose or suggest the features of claim 1 detailed above. Therefore, the combination of Junqua and Molnar fails to disclose all of the features recited in the claim from which claim 5 claims its dependency. Consequently, claim 5 is also allowable.

Applicant solicits an early action allowing claims 1-9.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no.44912-2019600.

Dated: September 19, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Adam Keser
Registration No. 54,217
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 760-7301 – Telephone
(703) 760-7777 – Facsimile

AMENDMENTS

In the drawings:

Replace the original Figure 1 with the amended Figure 1 included on the attached drawing sheet.